

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the final Office Action mailed February 27, 2007. Claims 1, 2, 4-11, and 13 are pending in the application. Claim 9 is allowed, and claims 6-8 are objected to. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, and 13 were rejected. Claims 1 and 10 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,800,867 to Matsunaga et al. Claims 1 and 10 are the only independent claims of this rejected group, the preambles of which have been amended to emphasize that the liquid material is dispensed as an attenuated continuous stream. Applicants traverse the rejections of claims 1 and 10 because Matsunaga '867 fails to teach "a controller . . . operable to actuate said air valve in a manner that pulses the pressurized air discharging from said air outlet . . . to move the liquid material discharging from said liquid discharge outlet in a desired pattern as an attenuated continuous stream," as recited in claim 1, or "pulsing the pressurized air while dispensing the liquid material to cause the liquid material to move in a desired pattern as an attenuated continuous stream," as recited in claim 10 (emphasis added). Rather, Matsunaga '867 is directed to an apparatus for dispensing liquid or powder material as a distribution pattern of dots or sprayed material.

In Matsunaga '867, the flow of liquid or powder material from a dispensing gun is acted upon by a plurality of blowout flows that break up the dispensed material into

discrete agglomerates (see e.g., Matsunaga '867 at col. 2, lines 11-22; col. 8, lines 6-8). When the material flow is linear, the resulting distribution pattern will be discrete dots (Matsunaga '867 at col. 6, lines 43-65). When the material flow is an atomized stream, the resulting distribution pattern will be in the form of a spray (Matsunaga '867 at col. 6, line 66 - col. 7, line 16). In either case, the blowout flows break up the dispensed material into discrete dots or spray patterns, and do not move the dispensed material as an attenuated continuous stream. While Matsunaga '867 uses the term "stream," this term is defined at col. 5, lines 30-34 to refer to liquid dispensed as drops, droplets, or atomized particles in a spray. Accordingly, there is no teaching in Matsunaga '867 of a controller that pulses pressurized air discharging from an air outlet to move liquid material in a desired pattern as an attenuated continuous stream, as set forth in claim 1, or pulsing pressurized air to cause liquid material to move in a desired pattern as an attenuated continuous stream, as set forth in claim 10.

In contrast to Matsunaga '867, paragraph 0022 of Applicants' specification describes operation of the dispensing system with respect to FIG. 2, stating that "[a]s air impinges the liquid material 12, the stream of liquid material 12 is displaced to create patterns of liquid material 12 on the moving substrate 14." FIG. 2 clearly depicts liquid material being dispensed from the nozzle and moved by the pressurized air as a continuous stream; not as dots, drops, or an atomized spray as taught by Matsunaga '867. Construing the language of claims 1 and 10 in a manner consistent with the specification, the attenuated continuous stream recited in claims 1 and 10 is not taught, or even suggested, by the dots, drops, or atomized spray of Matsunaga '867. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of

claims 1 and 10 over Matsunaga '867 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4, and 5 each depend from independent claim 1, and claims 11 and 13 each depend from independent claim 10. Accordingly, claims 2, 4, 5, 11, and 13 are each in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 10, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of these claims over Matsunaga '867 be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-8 were objected to for depending from rejected base claims, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants thank the Examiner for recognizing the allowable subject matter of claims 6-8 but believe that rewriting these claims in independent form is unnecessary in view of the foregoing remarks.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and the remarks set forth herein, Applicants believe this case is in condition for allowance and respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes any issue requires further discussion, the Examiner is respectfully asked to telephone the undersigned attorney so that the matter may be promptly resolved. The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is appreciated.

Applicants do not believe that any fee is due in connection with this submission. However, if any fees are necessary to complete this communication, the Commissioner may consider this to be a request for such and charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

/David W. Dorton/
David W. Dorton, Reg. No. 51,625

2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 241-2324 (voice)
(513) 241-6234 (facsimile)